



46TH TERG MEETING REPORT

February 8-9 2022

Virtual

Objectives of the 46th TERG Meeting

1. To discuss plans for new evaluations – community engagement, TB prevention, RSSH (Resilient and Sustainable Systems for Health), 360-degree review;
2. To be updated on M&E framework development and transition plans;
3. To review and discuss progress on ongoing or recently completed evaluations - wambo.org pilot and C19RM; and
4. To review and discuss work plan for the remainder of 2022

Meeting Outcomes

- The TERG provided guidance to the incoming evaluation teams on the community engagement and community led response and TB prevention evaluations.
- TERG members were satisfied with the insights on the C19RM evaluation and recognized the challenges of confirming countries for case studies. They assured the evaluation team that this has been discussed with the Global Fund Secretariat at an executive level.
- The TERG provided guidance on areas to be strengthened on the C19RM evaluation noting that the evidence will feed into implementation considerations for the new Global Fund strategy.
- The TERG requested that critical points in the wambo.org pilot evaluation report, particularly on some of the recommendations, be further clarified in the position paper.
- The TERG discussed the transition timeline for the independent evaluation panel (IEP) model and the recruitment of the chief evaluation and learning officer (CELO) for the new evaluation unit.

Next steps

- Submission of inception report of the community engagement and community led response and TB prevention evaluation before the end of February;
- Input from TERG members to the draft TERG position paper on wambo.org pilot and submission of the position paper in advance of the SC meeting in March 2022;
- Confirmation of proposed TERG evaluations in the workplan for 2022.

DAY 1, Tuesday February 8

Session 1: Introductory remarks and declaration of conflict of interest Chair: Cindy Carlson

The TERG Chair welcomed all to the 46th TERG meeting, thanked participants for their preparations and introduced key objectives of the meeting and the agenda. She also highlighted some changes in the TERG membership. These include the departure of Osamu Kunii (Head of Strategy, Investment, and Impact division) from the Global Fund. She thanked him for his service to the TERG. She welcomed the new ex-officio TERG member from UNAIDS, Dr. Fodé Simaga who replaces Luisa Frescura and thanked Luisa for her service to the TERG. Finally, the TERG Chair asked members to disclose any conflicts of interest. No conflict of interest was disclosed.

TERG evaluation on community engagement and community led response

After an introduction by the Chair, the evaluation team, summarizing its pre-recorded presentation, gave an overview and preliminary remarks concerning the Community Engagement and Community Led Response evaluation. These remarks focused on six criteria to select countries for the case studies. TERG members, invited to offer other criteria to ensure a good range of countries, suggested an improvement to geographical representation. The team were keen that most countries remain in the sample but recognized the importance of flexibility.

The TERG Chair noted confirming country selection as a risk to progress in the evaluation given recent experiences with other evaluations. TERG members stressed that while the present country selection is based on sound technical aspects there may be reason to review how country selection is done to also deal with non-technical considerations (including country capacity to take on evaluations).

With regards to country selection, the Secretariat team members drew attention to the elevated levels of stress being experienced by PRs (Principal Recipients) and CTs (Country Teams) at present. The burdens on PRs and CTs have expanded. The Secretariat recommended country selection to focus on a broad range of countries to reduce pressure on those that are repeatedly selected.

The Secretariat and WHO emphasized the importance of articulating and defining concepts of community-led in the context of disease and general health programs. Concepts of community led in HIV, Malaria and TB disease areas can be quite distinct and differentiated. External partners also urged a need to focus on having a clear understanding of definitions of community and the importance of grounding community responses in appropriate institutional structures.

Plans for TERG evaluation of TB prevention

One of the TERG focal points for this evaluation made a presentation on the status and plans for TB prevention evaluation, covering the methods, challenges and risks associated with it, and its timeline. A consulting company has been selected to implement the evaluation but the contract had not yet been signed.

She also provided a description of the input by a consultant who had undertaken a document review. This input will be provided for the evaluation team in the inception phase.

TERG members proposed the evaluation consider Global Drug Facility (GDF) in the scope of the evaluation and be coordinated and synergized with the Community Engagement evaluation.

They emphasized that it is important to find synergies across evaluations (i.e., C19RM and TB Prevention) while also ensuring there is sufficient attention paid to the specific characteristics of the different evaluation topics. TERG members stressed the need for the TERG Secretariat and TERG Focal Points to have a holistic understanding of upcoming evaluations with a view to identifying concrete opportunities for coordination and synergies across evaluations.

C19RM evaluation update

The session Chair explained that this evaluation will play a very important role in inform the implementation of the new strategy and thanked the evaluation team for a comprehensive pre-recorded presentation. The team lead provided an overview of the processes and a summary of initial evidence that had been gathered. He highlighted the challenges of agreeing on countries for case studies, in the midst of COVID-19 pandemic and elevated workloads among the Global Fund Country Teams and in-country stakeholders. He suggested further discussion to facilitate the process of country selection and a shift in the timeline.

In response the TERG assured the team that these discussions have commenced. They suggested inclusion of a country from west and central Africa for geographical representation and questioned whether the proposed shift in timeline is warranted given that country case studies usually have an even shorter turnaround time than in the current plan, emphasizing that the timeline is to ensure results are feed to the Strategy Committee (SC) and are able to feed into the new strategy

TERG members asked if it would be possible to look at what comparable organizations have done in this emergency. Concrete evidence on whether the CCM model is fit for purpose for COVID-19 response would also be important. Also discussed was the possibility of supplementing the evaluation findings with other concurrent TERG evaluation reports, e.g., the wambo.org pilot evaluation.

The team lead agreed and said his team would be finetuning its methods to capture points enumerated by the TERG e.g., on comparator for emergency response. He explained that the reason for suggesting a shift in the timeline was because they still hoped to make some country visits to gain a more complete picture but had not been able to do this before the countries were confirmed. However, they would attempt to submit in line with the agreed timelines if at all possible

The TERG requested to be updated on progress towards meeting deadlines for this assignment.

Discussion on wambo.org pilot TERG position, C19RM progress and any further comments on community engagement and TB prevention evaluation.

A TERG focal point for the wambo.org pilot gave a status update, highlighting some of the challenges faced by the evaluation team. A presentation included key points in the draft TERG position paper. The findings and conclusions of the report were categorized into six parameters, namely legislative, regulatory, policy and institutional framework; integrity and transparency; barriers, risks; impact; sustainability; value for money (VFM) analysis on economy, efficiency, and effectiveness.

The TERG discussed whether, and how, to include in the position paper one of the recommendations, i.e., the rapid impact analysis of wambo.org pilot on lives saved or cost saved. The TERG also debated other recommendations, e.g., evaluating the performance of wambo.org non-grant channel.

The session concluded with TERG members emphasising key areas for the community engagement and community led response evaluation team to include, i.e., interviewing communities at the grassroots and regional networks as well as clarification of the strength of evidence in the methodology.

DAY 2, Wednesday February 9

Session 2: Overall TERG work plan and preliminary plans for RSSH rapid assessment and for Country-Steered review Chair: Helen Evans

The TERG Chair presented an update on the TERG work plan for 2022:

- The wambo.org pilot evaluation position paper would soon be finalized to allow the Secretariat to develop initial management response ahead of the March SC meeting;
- A few other evaluations were moving forward (C19RM, Community engagement and community led response evaluation, TB prevention evaluation);
- Draft ToRs for evaluations on Data-driven decision-making, Challenging Operating Environment (COE), accelerating the equitable deployment and access to innovations, the Country-steered review and the RSSH mapping) were to be circulated to the SC for their review and input, and were expected to commence during Q2.

Participants welcomed the work plan update, and gave comments during the discussion;

- The **Data-driven decision-making evaluation**, undertaken with the OIG, will assess the progress made, and hindering and enhancing factors to data being used for decisions at country level and to identify lessons learned to inform the new strategy. The TERG agreed that the focus of the evaluation will be about the country level programs and that challenges around the use of disaggregated data, community-related data, and private sector data will be unpacked.
- **Challenging Operating Environment (COE) evaluation's** objective is to assess how the COE policy has been operationalized across the COE portfolio and to consider its implementation in terms of flexibility, partnerships, and innovation. Given the discussions around country selection for the TERG evaluations, the TERG raised concerns around the limited availability of countries as case studies, as this could affect the quality of the work.
- **The Country-Steered review's** objective is to develop, field-test and finalize a tool that enables a range of country partners, to provide anonymous and quality feedback to the Global Fund. The tool, once finalized, should be managed by the Evaluation Unit as part of the new M&E framework, but should be implemented through an independent, external entity reporting directly to the SC and the IEP. Comments on how to balance performance assessment needed by the Secretariat and confidential feedback aimed for by the SC/IEP/TERG were made. The TRP also reported on the interest in that body around this use and content of this tool, whether it was also going to assess the reception of the TRP comments at country level.
- **The RSSH mapping**, strongly requested by some of the SC, is useful to understand where the Global Fund stands in the broader RSSH landscape. TERG members discussed the challenges and feasibility of this mapping exercise, mentioning for example the availability of data and the way the results can inform Global Fund processes. The TERG leadership and focal points together with the TERG Secretariat are working with WHO to agree on the most realistic and useful manner to undertake this work.

Update from Secretariat on M&E framework development and transition plans, including Q&A

Update from Secretariat on the KPI framework

The Secretariat gave an update on the KPI development process, explaining the approach that will be used to define indicators for the KPI framework (Regular corporate Strategy Performance Reporting) and the modular framework (Grant programmatic performance assessment). The list of indicators gathered during Workshop 1 will be assessed by the Secretariat according to principles endorsed by

the 46th Board (importance, integration, accountability, actionability and availability). Once shortlisted, the indicators will be shared with external experts in “Workshop2”. The Secretariat explained there will be no KPI for partnership, seeing this facet of the GF model more as a lens.

Update from the Secretariat on the Transition process

The Secretariat gave an update on the transition to the Evaluation Unit and IEP. The IEP members recruitment was to be launched soon, and the CELO recruitment was underway. It was noted that given the ambitious work plan for the TERG this year, there will be a TERG/IEP overlap.

The IEP Selection WG which includes the TERG chair, has been approved by the SC. In March/April the WG will select IEP members and the IEP Chair for recommendation to the SC. From Q2 the focus of the IEP and CELO will be on operationalizing the new evaluation function and developing the multi-year calendar for Board approval.

Executive Session (2)

Chair: Cindy Carlson

TERG members commented on the work plan, with some clarifications regarding the ToR for the data-driven decision-making and discussed the country selections for the COE evaluation. They also made observations about country steered review and the RSSH mapping.

Further, the TERG discussed the update on the KPI selection process and the transition process. The TERG members were encouraged to share the advertisement for IEP members recruitment with their network. The TERG leadership discussed other points such as handover to the IEP in the coming months. The current TERG chair and vice chair will transition to become member of the IEP for up to 18 months. Two other TERG members will be selected by the IEP WG as part of the overall recruitment of IEP members, to ensure a good transition. Any TERG members interested were encouraged to apply.

Next Meeting

47th meeting will be split into two parts, a virtual part on 4 and 5 May and a face-to-face (if feasible) on 8 and 9 June.

Annex 46th TERG meeting participants TERG (8-9 February 2022)

TERG

Cindy Carlson
Beatriz Ayala-Ostrom
Daniel Whitaker
Evelyn Ansah
George Gotsadze
Godfrey Sikipa
Helen Evans
Mari Nagai
Marie Laga
Peter Barron
Erin Eckert
Esther Saville
Kenneth Castro
Fodé Simaga
Osamu Kunii

TERG Secretariat

Ryuichi Komatsu
John Puvimanasinghe
Jutta Hornig
Betty Brady
Sara La Tour
Marc Theuss
Uchenna Anderson Amaechi

TRP

Robin Gorna

Global Fund Secretariat

Johannes Hunger
Marijke Wijnroks
Harley Feldbaum
Abigail Moreland
Kate Thomson
Hui Yang
Rhiannon James
Evan Doyle

Michael Olszak-Olszewski
Nicole Gorman
Jinkou Zhao
Nathalie Zorzi
Abdallah Bchir
Theshika Kassen
David Traynor
Jamie Tonsing
Eliud Wandwalo
Shivam Gupta
George Shakarishvili

WHO

Clarisse Mason
Andy Seale
Archana Shah
Avinash Kanchar
Christian Gunneberg
Susan Sparkes

Health Management Support Team (HMST)

Roberto Garcia
Lorina McAdam
Christelle Boulanger

Pharos Global Health Advisors

Robert Hecht
Olusoji Adeyi
Nathan Isaacs
Joan Tallada

Other guests

James Tulloch (Chair M&E Working Group)
Kate Macintyre (TERG Leadership Advisor)
Remy Prohom (Procurement Expert)